EXHIBIT "A"

ADRIAN R. REID, ESQUIRE 200 CHESTNUT STREET SUITE 200 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

_IN THE UNITED STATES DIS FICT COURT
FOR THE EASTFRN DISTRICT OF FENNSYLVANIA

MICHAEL McKINNIS

CIVIL ACTION

Vs.

HARTFORD LIFE

NO.: 02-CV-3512

PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDI D COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO THIS COURT'S ORD ER OF MARCH 12 2004

AND NOW, comes the Plaintiff, Michael Mckinnis, by ard through his undersigned counsel, and avers as follows:

Preliminary Statement

This action arises pursuant I imployee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, 29 U.S.C. §1001 et seq., and more particularly § 1132 (a)(1)(b) thereof.

Jurisdiction

This court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to U.S.C §1132(e). It is also conferred jurisdiction by 28 U.S.C §1332(a)(1)().

- 1. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff Michael Mckinnis is an adult individual and citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 2. Defendant Hartford Life I usurance Company is an insurance company under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania an I has its principal place of business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

- 3. At all times relevant here to, Plaintiff, Michael Mckinnis was employed by Worldcom, Inc.
- 4. At all times relevant here to, Worlcom., Inc., has a Short-Term Disability Group insurance policy with Hartford Life.
 - 5. The Policy number was 436-78-0946.
 - 6. In May of 2000 Plaintiff reade a claim for Short-Term Disability under the policy.
- 7. Plaintiff provided the proper medical evidence for the claim including documentation of stress, anxiety and substance abuse.
 - 8. Defendant wrongfully deried the claim and has to this day wrongfully withheld the benefits due him.

COUNT I

BREACH OF CONTRACT IN VIOLATION OF ERISA

- 9. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if the same were set forth herein length.
 - 10. Defendant is plan administrator and fiduciary of the disability plan in question.
- 11. Despite Plaintiff's repeated oral and written requests, Defendant has failed to provide Plaintiff with the benefits due him under his terms of the policy and plan.
- 12. As a result of, and relying upon, his reasonable belief that he was insured against a disabling injury, and having not been advised o the contrary by defendant, plaintiff relied to his detriment
- 13. Plaintiff has made a proper demand upon Defendant for payment of benefits under the aforesaid policy and has not received sane to date.

15. The disability coverage afforded was intended to provided funds for food, shelter, medical expenses and other ne cessities for insured l'laintiff and defendant in the event that Plaintiff became disabled.

16. Plaintiff's disability prevented him from providing for such needs himself, and disability payments due to Plaintiff under the plan and policy were the sole source of income for the plaintiff and his family.

17. Defendant has failed to provide Plaintiff with the benefits due him, which is in William the ERISA law and regulations and is in breach of Defendant's fiduciary duty.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff is en itled to relief pursuant to ERISA, including but not limited to payment of benefits due with interest, payment of attorneys' fees and costs.

Adrian R. Reid, Esquire **Attorney for Plaintiff**